



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,823	05/03/2005	Shiro Ogata	AKSZ 200004US01	4176
27885	7590	03/03/2010	EXAMINER	
FAY SHARPE LLP			AUSTIN, AARON	
1228 Euclid Avenue, 5th Floor				
The Halle Building			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Cleveland, OH 44115			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/533,823	OGATA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AARON S. AUSTIN	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Ogata et al. (JP2002212463A).

Ogata et al. teach a titanium oxide conductive film forming liquid containing titanium oxide particles in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). The titanium oxide particles may be doped with materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel (translation paragraphs [0027]-[0028], [0051], [0061], [0067]). When in amorphous form, the doped titanium oxide composition is not photocatalytically active (translation paragraph [0086]).

Regarding claim 2, the titanium oxide particles may be in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). Further, the particles are modified with peroxy groups (translation paragraph [0015]).

Regarding claim 25, the titanium oxide particles may be in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). Further, the particles are modified with peroxy groups (translation paragraph [0015]). The titanium oxide particles may be doped with materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel (translation paragraphs [0027]-[0028], [0051], [0061], [0067]).

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogata (US 6,099,969).

Ogata teaches a non-photocatalytic film-forming titania-metal composite comprising non-photocatalytic amorphous titanium peroxide (column 4, lines 25-29; claims 1 and 5). The composite may be doped with any of a list of ceramic materials which may be copper or nickel compounds (column 5, lines 5-13; claim 4).

Regarding claim 2, the titanium *peroxide* includes peroxy groups.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Elfenthal et al. (US 5,451,252).

Elfenthal et al. teach titanium oxide compounds wherein the titanium oxide photocatalytic activity is decreased by doping titanium oxide particles with metal ions

and compounds thereof (Example 1). The dopants comprise any of copper, manganese, nickel, iron, and compounds thereof (column 3, lines 37-64).

Elfenthal et al. do not appear to teach all photocatalytic activity is lost. However, as like materials are used in a like manner as claimed for the same purpose of reduction in photocatalytic activity as claimed, the loss of photocatalytic activity is expected to be as claimed.

Regarding claims 21 and 23, the atomic/molar concentration of the dopant relative to titanium is 0.1 to 2.0 atom% (column 4, lines 6-8). This concentration overlaps the claimed molar ratio of titanium oxide to dopant of 1:0.01 to 1:0.5 (equivalent to a concentration of dopant relative to titanium of 1 to 50%).

Regarding claim 22, Elfenthal et al. teach examples wherein the titanium oxide particles may be rutile-type (column 6, lines 19 and 54). Further, the titanium oxide particles have a photocatalytic activity that is negated through the taught doping process. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a titanium oxide with photocatalytic activity is by definition anatase-type, brookite-type, or rutile-type as these are the three possible forms of photocatalytic titanium oxide (See for example Applicants Reply of 5/5/09 at page 6, lines 1-4).

Claims 1 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over DE2545243A.

DE2545243A teaches light stable titanium oxide compounds wherein titanium oxide photocatalytic activity is decreased by doping titanium oxide particles with metal ions. The dopants may comprise copper or manganese.

DE2545243A does not appear to teach all photocatalytic activity is lost. However, as like materials are used in a like manner as claimed for the same purpose of light stability, the loss of photocatalytic activity is expected to be as claimed.

Regarding claims 21 and 23, the atomic/molar concentration of the dopant relative to titanium is 10^{-4} to 2.5 atom%. This concentration overlaps the claimed molar ratio of titanium oxide to dopant of 1:0.01 to 1:0.5 (equivalent to a concentration of dopant relative to titanium of 1 to 50%).

Regarding claim 22, the titanium oxide particles have a photocatalytic activity that is negated through the taught doping process. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a titanium oxide with photocatalytic activity is by definition anatase-type, brookite-type, or rutile-type as these are the three possible forms of photocatalytic titanium oxide (See for example Applicants Reply of 5/5/09 at page 6, lines 1-4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata et al. (JP2002212463A).

Ogata et al. teach a titanium oxide conductive film forming liquid as described above.

Ogata et al. do not teach the molar ratio of the titanium oxide to the doping material.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the amount of doping material with respect to the amount of titanium oxide for the intended application, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In particular, as Ogata teaches inclusion of doping materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel improves conductivity (translation paragraph [0027]), one of ordinary skill in the art is provided with motivation to optimize the amount copper, nickel, or compound thereof added to achieve the improvements in conductivity. As like materials are being used in a like manner as claimed, it would be expected that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at the claimed molar ratio when optimizing the molar ratio result effective variable.

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata et al. (JP2002212463A) in view of Elfenthal et al. (US 5,451,252).

Ogata et al. teach a titanium oxide conductive film forming liquid as described above.

Regarding claim 22, while Ogata et al. teach the advantages of producing a film that does not have photocatalytic activity (translation paragraph [0086]), reduction of the photocatalytic activity of the anatase type titanium oxide particles is not taught.

Elfenthal et al. teach titanium oxide compounds wherein the titanium oxide photocatalytic activity is decreased by doping titanium oxide particles with metal ions and compounds thereof (Example 1). The dopants comprise any of copper, manganese, nickel, iron, and compounds thereof (column 3, lines 37-64). Therefore, as Elfenthal et al. clearly teach the ability to reduce photocatalytic activity for titanium oxides having photocatalytic activity through appropriate doping of metal materials, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to adjust these same metal materials in the composition of Ogata et al. for the anatase forms of titanium oxide to produce a film producing liquid having the same advantages of the amorphous type titanium oxide (translation paragraph [0086]).

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Elfenthal et al. teach the atomic/molar concentration of the dopant relative to titanium is 0.1 to 2.0 atom% (column 4, lines 6-8). This concentration overlaps the claimed molar ratio of titanium oxide to dopant of 1:0.01 to 1:0.5 (equivalent to a concentration of dopant relative to titanium of 1 to 50%). Therefore, as Elfenthal et al. clearly teach a concentration range/molar ratio overlapping

that claimed is sufficient to reduce photocatalytic activity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to adjust the dopant of Ogata et al. for the anatase form of titanium oxide in the amounts taught by Elfenthal et al. to reduce the photocatalytic activity.

Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the amount of doping material with respect to the amount of titanium oxide for the intended application, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In particular, as Ogata teaches inclusion of doping materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel improves conductivity (translation paragraph [0027]), one of ordinary skill in the art is provided with motivation to optimize the amount copper, nickel, or compound thereof added to achieve the improvements in conductivity. As like materials are being used in a like manner as claimed, it would be expected that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at the claimed molar ratio when optimizing the molar ratio result effective variable.

Regarding claim 24, the titanium oxide particles may be in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). Further, the particles are modified with peroxy groups (translation paragraph [0015]).

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata et al. (JP2002212463A) in view of DE2545243A.

Ogata et al. teach a titanium oxide conductive film forming liquid as described above.

Regarding claim 22, while Ogata et al. teach the advantages of producing a film that does not have photocatalytic activity translation paragraph [0086]), reduction of the photocatalytic activity of the anatase type titanium oxide particles is not taught.

DE2545243A teaches light stable titanium oxide compounds wherein titanium oxide photocatalytic activity is decreased by doping titanium oxide particles with metal ions. The dopants may comprise copper or manganese. Therefore, as DE2545243A clearly teaches the ability to reduce photocatalytic activity for titanium oxides having photocatalytic activity through appropriate doping of metal materials, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to adjust these same metal materials in the composition of Ogata et al. for the anatase forms of titanium oxide to produce a film producing liquid having the same advantages of the amorphous type titanium oxide (translation paragraph [0086]).

Regarding claims 21 and 23, DE2545243A teaches the atomic/molar concentration of the dopant relative to titanium is 10^{-4} to 2.5 atom%. This concentration overlaps the claimed molar ratio of titanium oxide to dopant of 1:0.01 to 1:0.5 (equivalent to a concentration of dopant relative to titanium of 1 to 50%). Therefore, as DE2545243A clearly teaches a concentration range/molar ratio overlapping that claimed is sufficient to reduce photocatalytic activity, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to adjust the dopant of Ogata et al. for the anatase form of titanium oxide in the amounts taught by DE2545243A to reduce the photocatalytic activity.

Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the amount of doping material with respect to the amount of titanium oxide for the intended application, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In particular, as Ogata teaches inclusion of doping materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel improves conductivity (translation paragraph [0027]), one of ordinary skill in the art is provided with motivation to optimize the amount copper, nickel, or compound thereof added to achieve the improvements in conductivity. As like materials are being used in a like manner as claimed, it would be expected that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at the claimed molar ratio when optimizing the molar ratio result effective variable.

Regarding claim 24, the titanium oxide particles may be in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). Further, the particles are modified with peroxy groups (translation paragraph [0015]).

Claims 2 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Elfenthal et al. (US 5,451,252) in view of Ogata et al. (JP2002212463A).

Elfenthal et al. teach titanium oxide compounds as described above.

Regarding claim 2, Elfenthal et al. do not teach the titanium oxide particles as being anatase-type. However, the titanium oxide particles have a photocatalytic activity that is negated through the taught doping process. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that titanium oxide with photocatalytic activity is by definition anatase-type, brookite-type, or rutile-type as these are the three possible forms of photocatalytic titanium oxide (See for example Applicants Reply of 5/5/09 at page 6, lines 1-4). It would be obvious to form anatase-type in selecting possible crystal formations from this finite list. Specifically, as the list of usable materials is short, one of ordinary skill in the art is easily provided motivation to address each of the crystalline forms for suitability for the intended purpose and thus arrive at the use of anatase-type as claimed.

Elfenthal et al. do not teach modification of the titanium oxide with peroxy groups.

Ogata et al. teach a titanium peroxide dispersion for forming conductive films having improved hydrophobicity (translation paragraph [0086]). The dispersion includes liquid containing titanium oxide particles in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). The titanium oxide particles may be doped with materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel (translation paragraphs [0027]-[0028], [0051], [0061], [0067]). Ogata et al. recognize the benefits of peroxidized titanium oxide particles for forming conductive films but the teachings are limited to the embodiments using non-photocatalytic amorphous titanium oxide (translation paragraph [0086]). Therefore, as Ogata et al. clearly teach peroxidized titanium oxide particles provides the advantage of improved hydrophobicity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to peroxidize the photocatalytic titanium oxide of Elfenthal et al.

Claims 2 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over DE2545243A in view of Ogata et al. (JP2002212463A).

DE2545243A teaches light stable titanium oxide compounds as described above.

Regarding claim 2, DE2545243A does not teach the titanium oxide particles as being anatase-type. However, the titanium oxide particles have a photocatalytic activity that is negated through the taught doping process. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that titanium oxide with photocatalytic activity is by definition anatase-type, brookite-type, or rutile-type as these are the three possible forms of photocatalytic titanium oxide (See for example Applicants Reply of 5/5/09 at page 6, lines 1-4). It would be obvious to form anatase-type in selecting possible crystal formations from this finite list. Specifically, as the list of usable materials is short, one of ordinary skill in the art is easily provided motivation to address each of the crystalline forms for suitability for the intended purpose and thus arrive at the use of anatase-type as claimed.

DE2545243A does not teach modification of the titanium oxide with peroxy groups.

Ogata et al. teach a titanium peroxide dispersion for forming conductive films having improved hydrophobicity (translation paragraph [0086]). The dispersion includes liquid containing titanium oxide particles in either amorphous or anatase form (e.g. translation at claims 1 or 3). The titanium oxide particles may be doped with materials

such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel (translation paragraphs [0027]-[0028], [0051], [0061], [0067]). Ogata et al. recognize the benefits of peroxidized titanium oxide particles for forming conductive films but the teachings are limited to the embodiments using non-photocatalytic amorphous titanium oxide (translation paragraph [0086]). Therefore, as Ogata et al. clearly teach peroxidized titanium oxide particles provides the advantage of improved hydrophobicity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to peroxidize the photocatalytic titanium oxide of DE2545243A.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ogata (US 6,099,969).

Ogata teaches a film-forming titania-metal composite as described above. Ogata does not teach the molar ratio of the titanium oxide to the additive (e.g., copper, nickel, or compound thereof) in the final product. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the amount of zinc compound with respect to the amount of titanium oxide for the intended application of negated photocatalytic activity, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In particular, as Ogata teaches inclusion of a copper, nickel, or compound thereof screens ultraviolet rays or the like while preventing static electricity generation (column 5, lines 1-13), one of ordinary skill in the art is provided with motivation to optimize the amount copper, nickel, or

compound thereof added to achieve the reduction of photocatalytic activity resultant form ultraviolet rays and the like. As like materials are being used in a like manner for the same intended result (negative effects of ultraviolet rays or the like which cause photocatalytic activity), it would be expected that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at the claimed molar ratio to maintain the reduction in photocatalytic activity taught by Ogata.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/5/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, Applicant argues Ogata '463 is not available under 102(a) or 102(b) as the present application has a priority date of November 7, 2002, which is less than a year after the publication date of the reference which is July 31, 2002. However, Ogata '463 does qualify as a reference under 102(b) as the publication date of July 31, 2002 is more than a year prior to the US filing date of November 4, 2003 (the filing of the corresponding PCT document which qualifies as a filing in the United States). As 102(b) allows for use of a reference with a publication date "more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States" (emphasis added), a reference published more than a year prior to the filing date in the United States qualifies as prior art. The perfection of benefit to the Japanese filing of November 7, 2002 does not overcome a rejection under 102(b) as it is not a filing in the United States. See MPEP

706.02(b). For this reason, Applicant's argument is not convincing and the rejections over Ogata '463 are maintained.

Further, Applicant argues on page 5 with respect to claim 21 that the argument that it'd be obvious to adjust the ratio of titanium oxide to the other components of the coating for the intended application is improper as Ogata '463 does not teach that the additive has anything to do with negating photocatalytic activity. (PLEASE NOTE: Applicant's argument refers to Ogata '969 but appears to apply to the rejection under 103 over Ogata '463). However, the argument does not address negating photocatalytic activity. In particular, the argument notes as Ogata teaches inclusion of doping materials such as copper, iron, manganese, or nickel improves conductivity (translation paragraph [0027]), one of ordinary skill in the art is provided with motivation to optimize the amount copper, nickel, or compound thereof added in relation to the remainder of the coating (titanium oxide) to achieve the improvements in conductivity. As like materials are being used in a like manner as claimed, it would be expected that one of ordinary skill in the art would arrive at the claimed molar ratio when optimizing the molar ratio result effective variable. As the argument does not address this argument it is unconvincing.

Second, Applicant argues Ogata '969 does not teach a non-photocatalytic coating but rather only teaches a non-photocatalytic amorphous titanium peroxide. However, the reference teaches the coating agent (namely the coating with the titanium oxide included therein) "has no photocatalytic function" (column 4, lines 25-29). For this

reason, Applicant's argument is not convincing and the rejections are maintained over Ogata '969.

Third, Applicant argues the Elfenthal reference 1) has a crystalline lattice excluded by the present claims, and 2) a different process is used to achieve the product than that used by Applicant. The first argument is unconvincing as the anatase type titania is present as particles in combination with the dopants prior to formation of the crystal structure (Example 1). It is the Examiner's position that the combination of anatase type titania including dopants qualifies as a "titania metal composite" as claimed. "Where the products produced by the reference process are neither transitory nor ephemeral but are by nature tangible and permanent pending the subsequent treatment to which they are subjected, Held that such products, though intermediate, in the reference, are anticipatory of the product defined by the claims on appeal." *Ex parte Brinton*, 82 USPQ 112. With respect to the second argument, Applicant has failed to note the differences in the processes used or any reason as to why the processes would result in a physical difference between the claimed product and that taught by the reference. The argument discusses the activity of the claimed composite as set forth in the present specification, but fails to set forth how this differentiates the present claims from the product taught by the reference. For these reasons the rejections are maintained.

`Fourth, Applicant argues DE2545243 discloses titania calcined with a compound containing ions resulting in a structure different from the claimed structure, which is simply a mixture of titanium peroxide articles with metals. The argument is unconvincing as prior to calcining the composition taught includes particles and dopants. It is the Examiner's position that the combination of particles and dopants qualifies as a "titania metal composite" as claimed. "Where the products produced by the reference process are neither transitory nor ephemeral but are by nature tangible and permanent pending the subsequent treatment to which they are subjected, Held that such products, though intermediate, in the reference, are anticipatory of the product defined by the claims on appeal." *Ex parte Brinton*, 82 USPQ 112. For these reasons the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON S. AUSTIN whose telephone number is (571)272-8935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer McNeil can be reached on (571) 272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Austin/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794